



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ever new device in the examination machinery is needed to make this idea practicable should be invented forthwith.

S. Thurber

Girls' High School, Boston

ROMAN EDUCATION *

CHAP. I. (*Concluded*)

THE ROMAN PEOPLE

Social Life—The Roman family was the unit of the Roman State. This could not be said either of Athens or Sparta. In the family we find, in its most pronounced form, the absolute authority of the father over all the members. "If any one thing," (says Becker in his *Gallus*,) "more strikingly exhibits the austerity of the Roman character and its propensity to domination, it is the arbitrary power which the father possesses over his children. By the laws of nature, immediate authority over the children belongs to the father only for the time during which they require his providing care, protection, and guidance. The humanity and right feeling of the Grecian legislators led them to look at the matter from this point of view, allowing the authority of the father to last only till the son was of a certain age, or till he was married, or was entered on the list of citizens; and they so restricted this power that the utmost a father could do was to eject his son from his home and disinherit him. Not so in Rome. There the child was born the property of his father, who could dispose of it as he thought fit. This power might last, under certain limitations, even till the death of the father." §

"The power we have over our children," says the Jurist Gaius, "is a right peculiar to the Romans." In truth we must regard the father of the family as both priest and *magistrate*.

* Professor Laurie's papers will be published in April by the Messrs. Longman in a revised and extended form under the title, "Historical Survey of Pre-Christian Education."

§ *Excursus* 11, *Scene* 11 page 179.

The unity of the family was further represented in the worship of the household gods, who protected the sacred hearth—the Penates. The *gens* or clan was merely an enlarged *familia*, and as each father and mother were priest and priestess in their own house, so the *gentes* had common altars and sacrifices. The state was thus made up of many little states bound together by mutual interests and religious ceremonies. The authority of the head of each family was the basis of the authority of the central power, and the obedience and military subjection of the members of the families and clans were the basis of that capacity for obedience and discipline which always distinguished the Roman.

The religion of the Roman state, it has been said, was simply the religion of the domestic hearth writ large, for the state too had its common hearth where the Vestal Virgins guarded forever the eternal fire which symbolized at once the sacredness and the purity of the Roman home. But while the Goddess of the Hearth, Vesta, held her central place of honour in the vaulted temple, supposed to have been built after the manner of the atrium of a house between the Capitoline and Palatine hills, she was worshipped not merely as a public goddess, as among the Greeks, but at every private hearth. The common meals of the family were taken round the hearth, and were a daily bond of family union and a daily act of worship. The Penates were household gods who protected the going out and coming in of the members of the family, and to whom at every meal libations were offered.

The practice of monogamy was not peculiar to the Romans, but the honour paid to the wife as head of the household seems to have been first fully recognized by them. The Spartan mother had a high place assigned to her, but owing to the public system of education, she exercised less personal influence than the Roman. Within the house woman was not servant, but mistress. She exercised a power almost equal to that of her husband. “Exempted,” says Mommsen, “from the tasks of corn-grinding and cooking, which, according to the Roman

ideas, belonged to menials, the Roman housewife devoted herself in the main to the superintendence of her maid servants, and to the accompanying labours of the distaff." She was not relegated to private life in a *gynceum* like the Athenian. She occupied the *atrium* surrounded by her servants and children. The woman being held in such high honour, and her permanent position as wife being protected by law, she felt that on her depended the honour of the family. The high moral character of the Roman matron thus became famous for all time ; and her influence on the character and education of her sons was unquestionably great. "Do not kiss me," said the mother of the victorious Coriolanus, "till I know whether you are an enemy or a son;" and when his wife fell on her knees weeping in support of the mother, the haughty conqueror yielded and said: "Mother, this is a happy victory for you and for Rome, but it is ruin and shame to your son;" and shedding tears retreated from his native city which he had doomed. We may then confidently accept the remark of Mommsen, that the "Roman family from the first contained within it the conditions of a high culture in the mere *moral* adjustment of the mutual relations of its members."

"As the strictly organized family," says Ihne (iv. 250,) "forms the basis for the national life of the Roman people and the starting point for the development of the State ; so also Roman morality and private economy were determined by the influence which the same family organization exercised upon every member of society, . . . labour, frugality, self-sacrifice for the good of the house and state were the active virtues of the old Roman peasant."

The depth of family feeling among the Romans, and the conservatism of their character are well illustrated by the practice of carrying masks of their progenitors to funerals, so that the head of a family might be said to be followed by his own ancestors to the last funeral rites.

Civil Relations—What now was the Roman in his civil relations as distinguished from the religious and the social ?

In the original constitution of Rome, the burgesses or free-men constituted the State. The elders of the 300 clans forming the community were the senate and coördinate with the king. The various members of the family, however distantly related, constituted the gens or clan. The senators who represented the clans—to the number of 300—were the king's council; but the ultimate appeal was to the whole body of Burgesses or Patricii. We see from this that from the first the Roman led a public and political life. The expulsion of the kings and the transference of power to the consuls and senate (509 B. C.) brought into being the most powerful aristocratic republic the world has ever seen. The Burgesses had alone originally the duty of bearing arms, which thus was a privilege. They were the Patres, and they and their families were called Patricians in opposition to the Plebs—those inhabitants of Rome who had gathered there after the original settlement. We have not time to dwell on any detailed account of Roman civil life, or to speak of the struggles between Patricians and Plebians. Enough is done for our purposes here if I point out the leading characteristics of Roman life generally. It is thus that we get a key to his conceptions of education. One great event in the development of Roman civil life must, however, be named—the appointment of *decemviri* to draw up a Code of Law. This code, approved by the senate and sanctioned by the assemblies of the people, was doubtless largely based on the customary law which had arisen in the preceding centuries. It was more in the interest of the masses of the people than of the aristocratic senate that there should be a code to which all might appeal. The object was “the equalizing of liberty,” for law as opposed to the arbitrary decisions of individuals, however wise, is liberty. These laws (“fountain of public and private law,” as Livy says,) constituted the basis of the great Roman jurisprudence, and in respect of language were concise, lucid, simple, and in all respects admirable. They were cut on bronze tablets and put up in a public place. The date of their publication was B. C.

450, and we may regard this as the second founding of the Roman state. The idea of Law and the supremacy of Law did not then for the first time enter the Roman mind. Its existence was signalized and confirmed by a public act which was not only the guarantee of Roman liberty, but an important factor in the history of European civilization.

Let us now sum up this brief survey : What have we already found ? A people with deep religious instincts which lead us to expect that religious instruction and sentiment will find a prominent place in the education of children ; an almost sacred family life, with an autocratic father, but happily also with a true house-mother at its head ; a free and intensely political public life—a life in the Forum—at once cause and effect of a strong sense of that community of the social organism which is at the root of all true patriotism, a deep sense of the supremacy of law, and in connection with all this, a military life reserved as an honourable function for the true citizen. In Rome the executive authority of the magistrate, whether king, consul, dictator, or emperor, was never questioned any more than that the Council of Elders was the supreme authority. To the interests of the State as a whole every individual was prepared to sacrifice himself. This did not weaken the family idea. It was the chief glory of the leading families to have served the State nobly. “ Life in the case of the Roman,” says Mommsen, (11:4-8) “ was spent under conditions of austere restraint, and the nobler he was the less was he a free man. All-powerful custom restricted him to a narrow range of thought and action ; and to have led a serious and strict life, or, to use a Latin expression, a grave and severe life, was his glory. Nothing more or less was expected of him than that he should keep his household in good order and unflinchingly bear his part of counsel and action in public affairs. But while the individual had neither the wish nor the power to be aught else than a member of the community, the glory and the might of that community were felt by every individual bourgeois as a personal possession to be

transmitted along with his name and his homestead to posterity ; and thus as one generation after another was laid in the tomb and each in succession added its fresh contribution to the stock of ancient honours, the collective sense of dignity in the noble families of Rome swelled into that mighty pride of Roman citizenship to which the earth has never perhaps witnessed a parallel, and the traces of which—strange as they are grand—seem to us whenever we meet them, to belong as it were to another world. It was one of the characteristic peculiarities of this mighty pride of citizenship that, while not suppressed, it was yet compelled by the rigid simplicity and equality that prevailed among the citizens to remain locked up within the breast during life, and was only allowed to find expression after death ; but it was displayed in the funeral of the man of distinction so intensely and conspicuously that this ceremonial is better fitted than any other phenomenon of Roman life to give to us who live in other times a glimpse of the wonderful spirit of the Romans."

But the civic and civil life of the Romans could not have sustained itself, even with the help of that respect for ancestry which was a part of the veneration for the forms as well as the life of the past, had it not been for the instinctive recognition of law as the basis of true liberty which made Rome an ever-extending and enduring power. "The Romans were distinguished," says Ihne (IV. p. 7), "from all other nations not only by the extreme earnestness and precision with which they conceived their law and worked out the consequences of its fundamental principles, but by the good sense which made them submit to the law once established, as an absolute necessity of political health and strength. It was this severity in thinking and acting which, more than any other causes, made Rome great and powerful. . . . The divine law, the elder sister of the civil law, was the pattern on which the latter was moulded. Both were characterized by the same severity, systematic order, deference to fixed formulas and fear of change."

The personal character of the Roman—The character of the

Roman is sufficiently indicated in what we have already said ; but a few more words seem necessary, as the tradition of character no less than that of civic life and duty, was the main source of the education of successive generations for the first 350 years of the city's life.

In the Roman, as we have seen, a personality more intense than the Hellenic is visible. He exists not merely for the state, but the state exists in and through *him*. From the first a certain self-sufficing Stoic dignity characterizes him. Roman personality asserts itself as subordinate to the state, yet governed by the thought that the state exists through and by virtue of the individual and the family which the Father represents. The state needs the individual, and each citizen bears the burden of the civil life. The feelings of Personality, of a Regulative Will, and of obligation to Law and Duty are closely interwoven in their roots in human nature ; and where they exist we should expect to find those complex virtues flourish into which Personality, Will, and a sense of Law most largely enter. These virtues are, Integrity, Courage, Resolution, Persistence, Fidelity, Justice in the sense of Law. The very naming of these ethical characteristics recalls to our minds the ancient Roman of tradition—the founder of an Empire. With such a people you expect to find great administrative ability. They are born to govern, and to conquer that they may govern. Their persistency, nay pertinacity, explains itself. Mark the saying of the proud and overbearing Roman :—

“Rome must never conclude a peace, save as victor,”
an issue of war only attainable by inflexible hardness and more of the external show than the reality of justice so far as enemies were concerned. With such a people you expect to find an equal power of subduing nature to their imperious and imperial will. Their roads, their bridges, their aqueducts, their public buildings testify to this.

As the people par-eminent of Practical Reason and governed by utilitarian conceptions, the relations of men as holders of

property, which represented to the eye of sense their personalities, are always vividly present to them, and we are not surprised to find a keen perception of relative rights, of practical justice, as between members of the same state at least, and the consequent creation of a sound jurisprudence which with the extension of the Empire becomes vast and imposing and from being civic and national becomes imperial and cosmopolitan. To the remark that Greece conquered took Rome captive by its Arts—may be aptly opposed this that Rome fallen took its victors captive by its law and still indeed holds them bound.

The beautiful, however,—art and the softer and gentler emotions—are as incompatible with such natures as a joyous delight in life for mere life's sake and in nature for nature's sake. These things are to be met with; but they are not indigenous :—even these Rome must conquer and lay its war-like hands upon and affect to enjoy.

With all their great qualities, and in perfect consistency with them, it is yet true, as Ihne says, “they were a cold, calculating, selfish people, without enthusiasm or the power of awakening enthusiasm, distinguished by self-control and an iron will rather than by the graces of character. They were proud, overbearing, cruel, and rapacious.” (Vol. 1, p. 120.)

Wealth and power ultimately destroyed the Roman character as they had demoralized the Spartan and broken up the Persian empire. No nation has yet been found which has been able to resist the insidious inroads of wealth, especially when that is concentrated (as seems to be inevitable) in the hands of a small minority of the citizens. There arises a rivalry in self-indulgence and ostentation and the result is that the maintenance and advancement of the state are soon superseded by personal aims and ambitions. In presence of the appetite for self-aggrandizement the civic virtues gradually disappear and the nation is doomed. Where each seeks his own things and not also those of another the community of feeling which constitutes a commonwealth, is gone and there exists a

veiled internecine war which must make it an easy prey to external foes, unless it be saved by an internal revolution. We may, in the passing fashion of the hour, talk of a state being an organism, but, after all, it is a mass of individuals and it is only by the education of these individuals and the sanctity of the family, that we can hope permanently to sustain public virtue.

What means now did the Roman take for maintaining his greatness, by educating those who were to bear the burden of the state after their fathers had passed away?

S. S. Laurie

University of Edinburgh

NOMENCLATURE IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

It would be hard to find a finer example of the American contempt for tradition—so often another name for order—than in the hap-hazard nomenclature in secondary schools. One might expect that just as the colleges early established names for their classes, so the preparatory schools would follow, perhaps, the English lines; and once adopting, even in a few New England communities, a set of descriptive terms, would unite upon a common system, to be copied naturally by all the schools of the country. This, however, was not the case. Schools of a kindred character, even in the same commonwealth, evidently cut loose from each other in the matter of class names, and set forevermore the vicious habit of establishing in each school a nomenclature peculiar unto itself. That the practice endures to this day need not be urged upon men and women engaged in this work. It is one of the curiosities of our “system”; an evidence of our national amiability; a serious check, in fine, upon the development of secondary school programmes.

In any attempt to investigate the real condition of things, it was necessary to secure data from all parts of the country. The following request was, therefore, sent to several hundred institutions, including many public high schools, and nearly all